1	CITY OF NORTH CANTON, OHIO
2	
3	
4	IN RE:
5	NORTH CANTON)
6	COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE) VIRTUAL MEETING)
7) TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Transcript of Proceedings held virtually before
13	North Canton City Council, taken by the undersigned,
14	Shannon Newhall, a Registered Professional Reporter
15	and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, at the
16	offices of North Canton City Hall, 145 North Main
17	Street, North Canton, Ohio, on Monday, the 19th day of
18	April, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Premier Court Reporting Canton 330.492.4221 Akron 330.928.1418
25	www.premierreporters.com

	·
1	APPEARANCES:
2	Daniel Jeff Peters, Chairman
3	Douglas Foltz, Member
4	Stephanie Werren, Member
5	Daryl Revolt, Member
6	Mark Cerreta, Member
7	Dominic Fonte, Member
8	Matthew Stroia, Member
9	Stephan B. Wilder, Mayor
10	Patrick DeOrio, Director of Administration
11	Catherine Farina, Deputy Director of
12	Administration
13	Jina Alaback, Director of Finance
14	Robert Graham, PE
15	Martin B. Van Gundy, IV, Chief Building Officer
16	Benjamin Young, Council Clerk
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	MR. YOUNG: All right. It's 7:00.
2	MR. PETERS: All right. Let me know when
3	we are up.
4	MR. YOUNG: We are ready when you are.
5	MR. PETERS: All righty. Thank you, Ben.
6	At this time, I would like to call to order
7	the North Canton Committee of the Whole
8	meeting, April 19th, 2021. The time is 7:00
9	p.m.
10	Ben, would you please call the roll?
11	MR. YOUNG: Member Stroia.
12	MR. STROIA: Here.
13	MR. YOUNG: Member Peters.
14	MR. PETERS: Here.
15	MR. YOUNG: Member Revoldt.
16	MR. REVOLDT: Here.
17	MR. YOUNG: Member Cerreta.
18	MR. CERRETA: Here.
19	MR. YOUNG: Member Fonte.
20	MR. FONTE: Here.
21	MR. YOUNG: Member Foltz.
22	MR. FOLTZ: Here.
23	MR. YOUNG: And Member Werren.
24	MS. WERREN: Here.
25	MR. YOUNG: Seven present.

MR. PETERS: All right. Thank you very much. First up, community and economic development. Chairman Revoldt, the floor is yours.

MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Item 3A, we have an amendment to Chapter 1182, how our zoning map will be amended. And if you'll notice in your packets, we have a one-page description of this new process.

This is going to do two things. The first is it's going to streamline the process for amending the zoning map. But I think more importantly is that if you get down to Section 2, just that we are going to run this through, in part, the Clerk's office.

And, Ben, feel free to jump in here. But the whole idea is to make sure we have got somebody who's accountable. We have had some situations in the past where perhaps changes had been made, and they never quite make the map.

So what we want to do is make sure that we have a smooth and simple process, but we also make sure that the changes actually get

1	recorded. Ben, how does that sound?
2	MR. YOUNG: Sounds just about right.
3	What this really focuses on is lowering the
4	application requirements.
5	MR. REVOLDT: Yes.
6	MR. YOUNG: A, making it easier for
7	and cheaper for members of the public to
8	apply for zoning amendments. And then B, not
9	making us handle information that we don't
10	really need to make a zoning amendment, such
11	as a topography map.
12	At this point, we have access to that
13	information easily and quickly through the
14	auditor's website, so we don't really need
15	people to submit topography maps anymore.
16	And that's just an example of something we
17	are getting rid of.
18	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Streamline and
19	accountability. So thank you, Ben. Do we
20	have any questions or comments from the
21	Council?
22	MR. PETERS: No, sir.
23	MR. REVOLDT: If not excuse me?
24	MR. PETERS: No.
25	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. If not then, I'll

1	make a motion that we put this on the agenda
2	for a first reading next Monday night.
3	MR. FOLTZ: Foltz seconds.
4	MR. STROIA: Stroia seconds.
5	MR. FONTE: It's going to be on
6	emergency, right? Is that correct?
7	MR. REVOLDT: It does. I mean, we can
8	give it one reading Monday night and bring it
9	back a second time, if you'd like, Dom.
10	MR. FONTE: I'm good with an emergency.
11	I mean, as long as it makes it easier, more
12	cost effective and efficient for the
13	consumers, I think I'm all for that.
14	Okay?
15	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Perfect. It does
16	have an emergency clause in it.
17	MR. PETERS: All right. So we have a
18	motion and a second. All in favor, say
19	"aye."
20	MR. FOLTZ: Aye.
21	MR. PETERS: Aye.
22	MR. REVOLDT: Aye.
23	MR. CERRETA: Aye.
24	MR. FONTE: Aye.
25	MS. WERREN: Aye.

1	MR. STROIA: Aye.
2	MR. PETERS: Opposed?
3	(No response.)
4	MR. PETERS: All right. Motion carries.
5	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Okay. Item 2 is we
6	are bringing back, as we indicated, a new
7	Main Street District regulations. We had
8	some amendments from our work session. And
9	if you'll notice on page 7 of your packet, we
10	have got the changes.
11	Ben has prepared a cheat sheet for us,
12	and these will be incorporated next Monday
13	night. So what I'd like to do is have
14	everybody take a quick peek at this, and then
15	next Monday night, we'll amend the ordinance
16	for its second reading and insert these, and
17	then flip them over to the Planning
18	Commission.
19	MR. YOUNG: Tonight.
20	MR. REVOLDT: Yes.
21	MR. YOUNG: The Planning Commission is on
22	Wednesday.
23	MR. REVOLDT: Is that Wednesday?
24	MR. FONTE: Hey, Daryl, quick question.
25	MR. REVOLDT: Yeah.

1	MR. FONTE: Dom here. Did we mention
2	anything I know we were talking about the
3	light poles with the LEDs and that. Is it
4	possible in the appropriate areas to be able
5	to go up an additional 10 feet to 30, instead
6	of 20? Is that anywhere to be found in this
7	section or any section of the Main Street
8	District?
9	MR. REVOLDT: I don't see it.
10	MR. FONTE: That would be something, Pat,
11	if you can help, maybe see if we can like
12	in commercial areas, where it's not right up
13	against residential. And the people that
14	got went up to Green, where you know,
15	it really looks good.
16	MR. REVOLDT: Would you chase that for us
17	for next week then?
18	(No response.)
19	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Are there any other
20	questions or suggestions for this? And I'll
21	come back to the map in just a minute. Is
22	there anything else?
23	(No response.)
24	MR. REVOLDT: Okay then. I'm going to
25	make a motion that we include these

1 amendments. 2 MR. CERRETA: One other thing, Daryl, if 3 you don't mind, because I'm looking -- I 4 thought maybe we were going to go through 5 these, but we are not. Okay. I did have 6 some suggestions I didn't see on here. 7 One was about fencing. You know, one of 8 the best things we have in our community 9 or -- or one of the most classiest things, I 10 think, is fencing with both stone and wrought 11 iron kind of looking. 12 And in here, the fencing is just 13 either -- it -- it pretty much gets you away 14 from that. It doesn't allow you to have a 15 stone wall. And there is nothing like a nice 16 stone wall around a restaurant with fencing 17 that's wrought iron or something. 18 So maybe I'm missing that. But I know 19 that was one of my suggestions. I didn't see 20 it in there. Maybe -- so I want to know why 21 that didn't make it. 22 MR. REVOLDT: Okay. 23 MR. CERRETA: And then --24 MR. REVOLDT: Would --25 MR. CERRETA: Let me finish here, just --

1		I got two of them on there. And then wrought
2		iron, wrought iron is in this, which is
3		great, but it doesn't have to be exactly
4		wrought iron. Wrought iron is very
5		expensive. So maybe with a look-alike
6		wrought iron, you know, that's made out of
7		aluminum. You know, so the word "wrought
8		iron" sometimes could be you know, that's
9		really, really expensive if you go with pure
10		wrought iron.
11		MS. WERREN: Great suggestion.
12		MR. REVOLDT: Okay. So, Mark, let me
13		let me see if I can capture this for you.
14		What you would like is to see something that
15		permits wrought iron or an esthetic
16		substitute. How does that sound?
17		MR. CERRETA: Yeah. You know, look-alike
18		substitute.
19	,	MR. FONTE: Yeah, I'd say look-alike,
20		similar to the look of wrought iron.
21		MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Very good.
22		MR. YOUNG: So if if I may, I believe
23		the we did try to incorporate Member
24		Cerreta's suggestion. So what I have
25		highlighted on the screen here, from your
	1	

description, we understood it to be similar to like the fence that has been put in next to the Saint Paul's parking lot, where it's primarily wrought iron, but then it has stone support columns.

MR. CERRETA: That's part of it. It could be a wall, though, that's like 3 feet high or 4 feet high, and then -- and then, you know, wrought iron on -- you know, for gates. So, you know, I have seen stone walls, but then the gates are wrought iron looking thing. That's pretty classy. We don't even allow that for restaurants or anything like that.

MR. DEORIO: Mark, I don't think that a stone wall would constitute a fence. So, I mean, that would be governed by the -- the zoning that deals with walls.

MR. CERRETA: Well, it says on pools and that. It puts in there you can have a stone wall or a -- fencing is -- you know, it's a -- it's a -- what do you want to call it -- a separation kind of a thing. So, okay, if -- so are you saying then, Pat -- and I get it, if that's the case -- someone can put

1	a stone wall up and not really call it a
2	fence then?
3	MR. DEORIO: That's right.
4	MR. CERRETA: Okay. Then I'm good with
5	that.
6	MR. DEORIO: I mean, it can be used
7	yeah.
8	MR. CERRETA: That makes sense. Okay.
9	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. We good, Mark?
10	MR. CERRETA: Yeah. Yeah. Again,
11	though, I'd like to get back to what Ben
12	said, though, you know, that wrought iron
13	kind of look. Because, I know, you know,
14	people always put it's aluminum now. It's
15	not real wrought iron.
16	MR. REVOLDT: Mark, I'm looking at
17	1136.15, what's on the screen, and it is on
18	page 15 of the packet. It's item 1136.15(B),
19	wrought iron or wrought iron simulation
20	fences.
21	MR. CERRETA: Good. Okay. I didn't see
22	it on the thing that we had in front of us
23	here.
24	MR. REVOLDT: Yes, but it is here.
25	MR. CERRETA: Okay. Good.

1	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Let's keep reading
2	this. Again, we need to nip we need to
3	need to look for these little little
4	tweaks. So we'll send this on to the
5	Planning Commission. We'll send it for
6	our with these changes for Monday night,
7	next Monday.
8	So I I guess I need a motion to do
9	those things. And I'll make that motion. Do
10	I have a second?
11	MR. CERRETA: Cerreta seconds.
12	MR. PETERS: All in favor, say "aye."
13	MR. FOLTZ: Aye.
14	MR. PETERS: Aye.
15	MR. REVOLDT: Aye.
16	MR. CERRETA: Aye.
17	MR. FONTE: Aye.
18	MS. WERREN: Aye.
19	MR. STROIA: Aye.
20	MR. PETERS: Opposed?
21	(No response.)
22	MR. REVOLDT: Thank you.
23	MR. PETERS: Motion carries.
24	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Item 3C is simply
25	the change to we are going we are going

1	to eliminate the previous map of of and
2	language. I don't think that's particularly
3	controversial. So we'll continue on that
4	path. Are there any questions about that?
5	Again, we are just erasing from the books the
6	existing language and substitute with the
7	new.
8	MR. PETERS: We are good.
9	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Very good then. Do
10	we need a motion? I'll make a motion that we
11	continue this. Is there a second?
12	MR. PETERS: Yeah.
13	MR. REVOLDT: Mr. President.
14	MR. PETERS: I'll second it.
15	MR. REVOLDT: All in favor, say "aye."
16	MR. FOLTZ: Aye.
17	MR. PETERS: Aye.
18	MR. REVOLDT: Aye.
19	MR. CERRETA: Aye.
20	MR. FONTE: Aye.
21	MS. WERREN: Aye.
22	MR. STROIA: Aye.
23	MR. REVOLDT: Okay. Let's get on to 3D.
24	This is the one that we need to make a couple
25	changes. If you'll notice on the cheat

sheet, we are going to have some deletes and 1 2 an add. It's at the very bottom of the page. 3 What we are going to do is we are going to 4 add a parcel to the Main Street District. 5 This is the one that's City-owned on 6 Stratavon property -- this is the Stratavon 7 properties. We are going to add those. 8 And we are going to then -- we are going 9 to delete parcels on Portage Street. 10 these are the residential properties that run 11 from basically Hillcrest, east to the school. 12 MR. PETERS: Daryl, forgive me here, what 13 page are we on? 14 We are looking at -- we are MR. REVOLDT: 15 looking at the bottom of page -- hang on a 16 second -- of 7. 17 MR. PETERS: Okay. Got you. 18 MR. REVOLDT: Okay. And we'll have those 19 parcel numbers. But we are going to just 20 clean up -- we have some residents up in 21 Doug's ward who prefer not to be included in 22 the new Main Street District, so we are going 23 to -- we are going to delete those and leave 24 them as is. 25 MR. PETERS: Okay.

1	MR. REVOLDT: Did I do okay on that?
2	MR. FOLTZ: Yeah. Daryl, do we have a
3	do we have a map now to look at, or is that
4	something that's going to come later?
5	MR. REVOLDT: It's going to come.
6	MR. FOLTZ: Okay.
7	MR. REVOLDT: I think the only parcel
8	that is not going to be removed is the City
9	parking lot, which is on the east side of
10	Northminister Church. But everything else is
11	going to is going to come off and remain
12	as is.
13	MR. FOLTZ: Okay. Appreciate it.
14	MR. REVOLDT: And I think that will make
15	everybody happy.
16	MR. FONTE: Daryl, Dom here. So let's
17	say, for example, in Doug's ward, the
18	residents, you know, in six months to a year
19	change their mind and think it's a good idea
20	that they would like to be back in. Is it
21	what's the procedure to be able to do that?
22	MR. REVOLDT: It will be just like
23	amending the zoning ordinance. You'll have
24	to come back in and come in come in for a
25	zone change.

1	MR. FONTE: Okay.
2	MR. REVOLDT: But, you know, again,
3	that's a that's a that's a decision
4	that the residents and the Council will want
5	to weigh.
6	MR. FOLTZ: Uh-huh.
7	MR. REVOLDT: And, you know, I think one
8	of the things we want to be mindful of and
9	I have often said this before is that
10	zoning exists to protect the people who make
11	the initial investment.
12	MR. CERRETA: Yep.
13	MR. REVOLDT: And we want to make sure
14	that if those residents want a change, that
15	it's something that it's something that is
16	acceptable
17	MR. FOLTZ: Neighbor's do. Yeah.
18	MR. REVOLDT: to the neighbors.
19	MR. FOLTZ: Hey, Ben, is that your John
20	Madden scribbling
21	MR. YOUNG: Yeah.
22	MR. FOLTZ: Is that your teleprompter,
23	John Madden, you know, zoning map look here?
24	MR. REVOLDT: No. He's going to be
25	after the meeting.
i	

1	MR. DEORIO: He doesn't even know who
2	John Madden is, Doug.
3	MR. FOLTZ: Yeah. Okay. Well, I knew
4	you guys would know. Well, who's doing that
5	right now?
6	MR. YOUNG: I was going to say. Yeah.
7	MR. FONTE: He was a big-time wrestler.
8	MR. FOLTZ: You know John Madden, don't
9	you?
10	MR. YOUNG: I do not. Sorry.
11	MR. PETERS: Oh, my God.
12	MR. CERRETA: Oh, my gosh is right.
13	MR. FONTE: He's a U UCF Champion.
14	MR. CERRETA: Tony Romo has kind of taken
15	that over a little bit.
16	MR. FOLTZ: Yeah, you're right. Mark,
17	you're right. Tony Romo is the new guy.
18	You're right.
19	MR. CERRETA: All right.
20	MR. FOLTZ: Yeah. Thanks for drawing
21	that out. That shows everything that we need
22	to be looking at to change. Thank you, Ben.
23	MR. REVOLDT: We'll get this we'll get
24	this squared away, but this is this is,
25	again, what the map will be will be

1	amended and adjusted. So if we don't have
2	any further questions, we are going to add
3	Stratavon to the north. We are going to
4	delete the properties here that have
5	been John Maddenized. And we'll have and
6	we'll pitch this over to the Planning
7	Commission as well and have it for our next
8	reading an as amendment. So I'll make that
9	motion. Is there a second?
10	MR. FOLTZ: Foltz seconds.
11	MR. PETERS: All right. All in favor,
12	say "aye."
13	MR. FOLTZ: Aye.
14	MR. PETERS: Aye.
15	MR. REVOLDT: Aye.
16	MR. CERRETA: Aye.
17	MR. FONTE: Aye.
18	MS. WERREN: Aye.
19	MR. STROIA: Aye.
20	MR. PETERS: Opposed?
21	(No response.)
22	MR. REVOLDT: Thank you, Ben. Thanks,
23	Council.
24	MR. PETERS: All right. Thank you,
25	Daryl.

Okay. Next up, finance and property. Chairwoman Werren.

2.0

MS. WERREN: Okay. So this is going to be a conversation -- I'll just start it, and then Pat is a great storyteller, so he's going to kind of explain the why we need this. And then as we know, Jina is great with data and numbers and has prepared a lot of the charts.

So I think it was almost four weeks ago that Matt and I met with Jina, Patrick, and the Mayor, and we started to talk about the finance and we started to talk about this, and the need for a change in the levies to the EMS and the fire, and kind of where -- where it was and what -- what our thoughts were and what kind of the community maybe would think or not think, and how we had to discuss that.

And then after looking at some of the data and some of the slides that Jina presented, we said let's have the lawyers take a look at it. And so they then took a look at it. And then we got all that back this week. And now we'd like to present that

1 to you tonight.

You'll see kind of -- and I kind of like starting with the summary. But -- because then we can go backwards. And so since 2018 when these were enacted, property taxes have raised \$9.8 million. But ambulance fees have raised 5.26, and during that same time, fire and EMS services cost the City \$26.8 million.

\$7.2 million have been transferred from the general fund. And the goal would be to not transfer any of those monies from the general fund, because, obviously, Dominic likes to talk streets and Doug likes to talk parks, and we all have our things that we like to talk. Well, if we had that \$7.2 million, maybe we could talk, you know, more of that.

And so there have been 24,000 calls for service over the past decade. So it's definitely a need our community has. Some other communities -- and you have heard a lot of talk about this recently -- is -- you have heard everything from dispatching moving to a centralized system. We have heard of -- of fire places, right, subbing things out. So

1	those are our options. But our community has
2	said, no, we want these things in place. So
3	how do we pay for them? And that is what we
4	are going to talk about now.
5	So is that a good lead in, at least? We
6	are looking for placement on the November 2nd
7	ballot, so we have backed this all up and
8	when we need to have this and all the
9	readings we need to have and everything. So
10	that's where I'll start it. Are there any
11	questions at this moment before I let
12	Patrick
13	MR. DEORIO: I think it would be
14	helpful this is Patrick that we go
15	through the PowerPoint that was
16	MS. WERREN: Yeah, I want to.
17	MR. DEORIO: And then that might answer
18	some questions along the way or it might
19	stimulate more questions.
20	MS. WERREN: Yes. And I thought were
21	you going to do the PowerPoint?
22	MR. DEORIO: Yeah.
23	MS. WERREN: Okay. That's what I
24	thought. That's perfect. All right.
25	Thanks.

MR. DEORIO: Ben. Here we go. All right. So if we -- we talk about, you know, where we are today. So we'll kind of look at these screens together. But I want to take, you know, proper time to go through this.

So our current fire services are supported by a half mill continuing levy.

And that has been in place since 2013. In 2021, we estimate that that's going to raise about \$187,000. And then this will need to be supplemented by, you know, more than half a million in transfers from the general fund.

And keep in mind as we talk about these things, that some of the discussions that you have had over the last year, when we have talked about the CRA and the DRD and these things, what we are really talking about is that, you know, North Canton suffers from a lack of increase in property values over a ten-year period. And that keeps these revenues, you know, relatively flat.

So all the things that you have been doing for the last year to queue up a very aggressive economic development plan, about bringing in jobs and capital investment, this

will help us in the long-term. But for right now, this is what we are facing.

So EMS services, supported by a one mill continuing levy, in place since 2013, and then a one and a half mill levy, which is a five-year levy, and that expires in 2021.

These EMS levies are expected to raise about \$935,000 this year. But we will be supplementing that by an additional \$600,000 in transfers from the general fund.

Now, North Canton has had a practice regarding ambulatory billing services that we quote/unquote soft bill. And that means that, you know, for City residents, that EMS will accept the -- the City will accept whatever their insurance pays and not bill residents for the balance of the bill. And that's the way it has been for a considerable period of time.

But keep in mind that, you know, what those insurance companies pay, you know, often is \$250, \$500. And you're looking at bills that range, you know, in the thousands. With everything that we have to do today, with all the technology that has to be

transported on every run, because we don't know for sure what we are going to run into, it becomes an expensive service call.

Next slide, please. So this is fire funding over the past decade. And the red line indicates, you know, basically what those expenses have been. You can see on your screen here that -- what that graph looks like. And I think Ben is going to phase in some other ones.

So we have here the -- this is what the property tax revenue is off of these levies. And you can see that it's fairly flat over the last ten years. So it's just -- it's just not getting the job done. And if we add in other revenue from billings and the like, you can see where we are at. And then if we add in the transfers, that's how we are making it work, is by transferring money from the general fund to keep these operations going.

If we take a look at the same format for EMS, you can see what -- where this is at and how the property tax revenue fills in the EMS billing and then other revenue. And then

transfers cover the rest.

But what's important to note that is -is that you look at -- and we get into the
slides in a few minutes -- you know, the
number of calls. You know, so when we -- you
know, years ago, decades ago, whatever it was
before all of us were here, decisions were
made, you know, for, you know, nursing homes,
skilled nursing facilities, adult centers.
You know, we are -- we are an aging
demographic in North Canton.

You recall about two years ago, we were named the 7th best retirement community in Ohio. That wasn't by design. We didn't try to become that. That's what we became.

Because we weren't really cognizant of what we were allowing to be constructed here, and those things have a cost associated with them, particularly in the EMS side.

Next slide, please. So if we look at, over the past decade, the average sources of revenue, and keeping the color scheme consistent, you can see for fire and EMS what the property tax has provided. And in general, we are woefully short.

And as these expenses continue to go up year after year and more calls are made, you know, we are going to reach a point where, you know, so much of the general fund is being transferred over to maintain these operations, that there is not going to be funds available for the other things that --

that the City desperately needs to be doing.

Next slide. So in 2020, we responded to 2,810 calls for service. We used the fire vehicle 6,618 times. We transported 1,589 people to area hospitals, provided life support for almost 2,000 people, and completed 2,089 inspections, plan reviews, fire education or other prevention services. And fire and EMS helped at least 5,000 people and businesses just last year.

And this is the benefit now -- so we talk about the cost, and we talk, you know, I guess of liabilities. Now we are talking about a benefit. This is the benefits of running your own place and not having to merge and create a -- a fire district and EMS district, is that you can deliver this level of service.

Stephanie's slide, in summary, you recall, you know, the numbers that she had indicated. And basically, you know, that hasn't changed. It's -- we are short. And we think that it's important that we have a transparent conversation with the community on what the costs are for the service that they expect. We think that once they understand that, and they decide that, hey, that is a service that we want, we believe that they'll support a levy in the fall.

But the levy proposal then is that we as

But the levy proposal then is that we are going to -- this is important, that we make sure this message gets out. We are talking about eliminating the 1.5 mills. And I'm not sure what comes after that, Ben, because my little thing that says I'm running my mouth is right over top of that.

MR. YOUNG: 1.5 mills of continuing levies.

MR. DEORIO: Of continuing levies. Thank you very much. So eliminating the existing 1.5 mills in continuing levies, and then we would be replacing -- replacing the fire levy with a 1.9 mill levy for the next five years.

1.5

Keep in mind here, we are not talking about continuing levies. We are not talking about putting a continuing levy back on.

We want to make sure that the residents of this community have an opportunity to voice on a regular basis their pleasure or displeasure with the way their services are being run and what they are having to contribute to make sure they run right.

So this one for the fire would raise an estimated \$850,000 annually. And then on the EMS side, a 3.9 mill levy would raise 1.75 annually. So in total, 5.8 mills replacing the 1.5 mills, and this would bring in approximately \$2.6 million on an annual basis.

So if these levies were to pass and be agreed to by the residents, this is kind of what it would look like. The fire fund, virtually all of that would be paid for. And then in the EMS fund, between property tax and EMS billing, that would pretty much cover that entire operation there.

And, you know, given that these are snapshots in time, based on, you know, what

property valuations are, determined by the county auditor, that, you know, when these levies would come up for renewal, we would hope that we would have done our other job of economic development that would be bringing in a lot more capital investment, a lot more jobs, creating more demand for housing, and we end up with an upward property valuation that would help spread these costs out, particularly into the commercial realm where we really need the big dollar investment.

1.5

Next slide. The cost to the homeowner. So the fire levy currently costs about \$13 for every hundred thousand in value. And the new levy would cost \$60. So that would be an increase on the fire side to about \$47 per hundred thousand of value on an annual basis.

EMS levy, current levy costs \$67 per hundred thousand in value. You see the new levy would be \$123. So that would be an increase of \$56 per hundred thousand in value. So the total cost, when you add those numbers together, would be \$183 annually per hundred thousand in value, which is an increase of \$100 -- \$103 on a hundred

1	thousand value per year.
2	Next slide. Are we going backwards? I
3	think we did that slide.
4	MR. YOUNG: It ends on this for
5	questions, summary, that kind of thing.
6	MR. DEORIO: Very good. Jina, would you
7	like to make some comments at this time
8	before we take questions?
9	MS. ALABACK: No. Actually, I think
10	that's a really comprehensive Ben, I
11	appreciate how you take all the numbers that
12	we provide and you put them into these very
13	explanatory slides. So I think it's it
14	really tells the story. Patrick, of course,
15	you explain it very well.
16	So I can answer questions, but I really
17	don't have anything to add. I think that was
18	a very good presentation.
19	MR. DEORIO: I'll open it up then for
20	questions.
21	MR. REVOLDT: Patrick, this is Daryl.
22	Would you describe for us I think we have
23	done historically a very good job in
24	structuring our fire and EMS. Would you care
25	to can you elaborate on that in terms of

paid volunteers, full time, et cetera, on how we are structured?

MR. DEORIO: Of course, you all remember back in the beginning, it was an all volunteer fire department, and we had the largesse of the Hoover Company that made that possible. And many of the people that were the volunteer firefighters worked at the Hoover Company.

But as time moved on, and as Hoover did too, we had to supplement volunteers with full-time firefighters, which we have been doing. And on the EMS side, the same thing, a full-time EMS department.

But along about -- I don't know -probably 20 years ago, thereabouts, I think
Mayor Rice or Mayor Held, whoever it was -it was around that timetable -- started the
process of trying to do a -- more of a hybrid
approach with the staffing levels and to try
to help cut costs.

And what we did was ended up being that, you know, if we were hiring a full-time firefighter, they also had to be an EMT, you know, medical technician qualified and able

to serve in both capacities. And then this -- this would help us with keeping our -- our payroll in line. And that has worked for a lot of years.

But where we are now at in the last couple years is that it's harder and harder to get the volunteer firefighters. That is an era that is not as popular as it used to be, and that we need to have full time. The number of EMS runs has exploded in the last five years. I think you can all recall the — the previous Mayor's State of the City addresses and the slides that they put up. And with those number of calls, you can't get all that done with the same level of people. So we have had to, you know, increase that gradually over time.

But as we look at what's happening in other communities, this is no different.

Other communities face the same problems.

They may have exited the volunteer side,

though, a lot earlier than we have. At some

point, that will be our faith, that we will

have to replace those volunteers with

full-time firefighters.

MR. REVOLDT: Thank you. That's exactly the point I was hoping you'd make.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Just to add a question on MR. CERRETA: top of that. We saw that huge increase in the last two years. All right. So what -and people are going to ask this, so we probably should have this down. What has been the increase in our calls over the last two years and the difference between administrative costs, raises, for example, administrative -- you know, other administrative costs? How many additional people have we hired over the last two years? Is that huge increase part of that? Or is it part of what we have been doing, you know, by making more calls and making more -- so those -- I mean, that two years has been the big difference, it seems like, on that one side in our total costs.

MR. DEORIO: It's great a question, Mark.

I think certainly in the last two years, the spike, you know -- you know, you see that.

That's very obvious. It jumps out at you.

But this has been an ongoing issue for, you know -- you know, a long time. And it's just

1 a matter of how we want to address it. 2 Jina and I could break out for our next 3 discussion on this those very points that we 4 are driving at. So we can break out, you 5 know, the personnel, how many -- people that 6 has changed, you know, if there are any 7 equipment needs that were different in these 8 last two years than before. 9 So I think that's a great one, and I'd be 10 happy to bring that back at our next -- when 11 we have our next discussion. We wanted to 12 start this process early. We didn't want to wait, you know, until the last minute, and, 13 14 you know, do this. This is very -- you know, 15 very important and I want to just say a very 16 serious topic for us, all of us. And we 17 should give it that level of -- of deep 18 thought. 19 So I appreciate those -- those insights, and we'll bring that back for our next 20 21 Committee meeting. 22 MR. FONTE: Patrick, just -- go ahead. 23 want to ask a question, but go ahead 24 everybody else. I'll do mine last. 25 MR. CERRETA: Well, just one more,

because I know we are going to be asking for this -- this safety station. Okay? People bunch this stuff together. Are we going to be able to -- or the community going to be able to -- to do that, both of these? Are they going to look at the next one when the station comes -- because that's the same thing -- and say, well, we just gave this? I mean, are -- gave this, you know, group a lot of money here now.

So are we trying to cut off too many branches of the tree in a very short period of time? Are we pruning too much? And I don't know when that's going to happen, the safety station. I'll ask. So --

MR. DEORIO: That's a considerable -there are a lot of moving parts to that, and
I don't think that we are going to be in a
position in the -- in the relatively short
time span to be able to deal with that. So
that's why I felt that it was more important
to, you know, talk about the operating.

Because regardless of whether we build it in a new building or not, the shortfall in the operating costs are going to remain the

2.0

same. So you put it in a new building, it's going to be the same. It's just you have to pay for a new building.

So we think that we need to get this house in order first before we go down the road of the other. So I don't see that happening, you know, in the next short period of time, in the next year or two.

MR. CERRETA: Okay.

MR. DEORIO: But the point is well taken.

MR. PETERS: Patrick, I have a few comments. And -- and just to echo what Mark said, those are great questions. And I think you are right, we do need to get those answered, to get out in front of those. You certainly have demonstrated the need from an operational standpoint.

What I like about it and what we have always done for as long as I have been on Council, any time we go to the voters for any type of levy, there is always a sunset provision on it. And this one is five, five years. And, you know, you have got five years to prove that you are using that money in a proper manner, and you are a good

steward of the taxpayers' funds. 1 So, you know, the -- the folks will get 2 another crack at the apple in five years to 3 see if you have proved what you said you were 4 going to do. So I do like that. 5 MR. DEORIO: Thank you. I think that, 6 you know, comes from, you know, having sat in 7 8 your chairs. Not a fan of the continuing 9 levy. MAYOR WILDER: I'd like to make a 10 comment, if I could, Mr. President. 11 12 MR. PETERS: Yeah, Mayor. MAYOR WILDER: You know, again, good 13 That five-year window, yes, 14 discussion. 15 that -- that is the -- is key for us, as we strive for economic development for the City, 16 for, you know, income tax, property tax for 17 We have -- I think we have the potential 18 us. for projects to go forward, and that gives us 19 20 a window to -- to recoup, I guess, the money that we are contributing to the EMS and fire. 21 I think, from what I can see, we have 22 about 13 full-time firefighter/paramedics, 23 24 and approximately 23 or 24 part-time

25

firefighters and -- and medics. Some are

1 firefighters and some are medics. Things 2 that -- that -- consideration, too, is the 3 amount of training also that goes in to what 4 we provide for our citizens, quality -- a 5 qualified person arriving at their door when 6 they call 911. And the restrictions that are 7 being placed on the fire department agencies 8 for increased training, and, you know, 9 decontamination now issues. 10 So it's just -- I think we -- when I came 11 into office, and working with the City 12 Administrator and finance, trying to look at 13 how best are we funding all of our -- our 14 services, and this was a very glaring point 15 of view, I guess, when it comes to looking at 16 the funding for all of our safety services. 17 And I -- the challenge now is before us 18 to -- how we can best keep the quality 19 services that we provide for our community. 20 And this is one of the avenues that you may have to take. So just my -- my thoughts on 21 22 it. Thank you. Is everybody good? Can I 2.3 MR. FONTE: 24 chime in now? 25 MR. PETERS: Yeah.